

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-25, 27-37, and 39-47 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 9, 17-18, 37, 39-42, and 47 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 16, 22, 37, 40, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,828,375 to Nomura et al. ("Nomura"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nomura does not teach, as required by amended claims 1 and 37, "the application maintain[ing] in a memory a state history of a document; and whenever an interesting operation has occurred, an interesting operation being an operation by the application that changes the state of the document in response to a user command, automatically captur[ing] the state of the document as it exists after the operation and adding the captured state to the state history of the document."

Nomura describes methods for keeping a history of a user's past and current work environments or "spaces". Each work space is represented by an "information unit set" (13:1-39) made up of "information units" -- which are the documents and applications present in the work environment at a certain time (13:12-22). The work space is analogous to a desktop, and Nomura describes methods for keeping a history of the various documents and applications that appear on that desktop. The history of Nomura is a history of a user's work, including an assemblage of documents and applications being used – not a state history of a document "kept by an application" where the application "changes the state of the document in response to a user command", as required by amended claims 1 and 37.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 37 as amended are allowable. The applicant also notes that the amendments to claims 1 and 37 make explicit what was previously implied by the language of their preambles, and therefore do not change scope of either of claims 1 and 37.

Claims 45-46 depend from claim 1 and claim 47 depends from claim 37, so claims 45-47 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claims 16 and 22 and claim 40 (as amended) are allowable because, just as Nomura does not describe a state history of a document kept by an application that changes the state of that document, Nomura does not describe an application that allows a user to designate one document state in the application's history list and use it to modify another state of that document. Nomura (col. 15, lines 31-43) describes allowing a user to edit attributes for an information unit, for example, changing the name of a document. But Nomura does not describe an application or program that "enabl[es] the user to designate any one of the identified states as a document state operand" or "performing operation with [] data from [a] second state on [a] first state", as required by claims 16, 22, or 40. Accordingly, the applicant submits that claims 16, 22, and 40 are allowable.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 2-7 and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nomura in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,630 to Kulkarni et al. ("Kulkarni"), although the Examiner cited only Nomura with respect to claims 3-7 and 23-24. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for the reasons given for claim 1. Claims 23-24 depend from claim 22, and are allowable at least for the reasons given for claim 22.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-15, 17-21, 39, and 41-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nomura in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,659,747 to Nakajima ("Nakajima") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,630 to Kulkarni et al. ("Kulkarni"). The Examiner appears to have rejected claims 25 and 27-33 on the same basis.

The Examiner acknowledges that neither Nomura nor Nakajima taught, as required by the previously presented claims 17, 18, 41, and 42, "keeping a history of document states of a document, the document states being created automatically whenever a user command to the application changes the state of the document and being complete in themselves", but asserts that Kulkarni (col. 7, lines 20-28) teaches this limitation. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Kulkarni teaches saving a web browsing history – either the URLs used to visit various websites or the documents that were retrieved by visiting those URLs – when a session terminates. Kulkarni's browsing history is not a history of the states of a particular document. Rather, it is, at best, a set of documents representing a variety of websites visited by a user. In addition and importantly, Kulkarni's browsing history is not created whenever a user command to the application changes the state of the document, as required by each of claims 17, 18, 41, and 42.

Applicant has, nonetheless, amended claims 17, 18, 41, and 42 as discussed with the Examiner (see Interview Summary of January 22, 2004) to make explicit that the document state history is “kept by the application”, and that the document states are “created . . . by the application” whenever a user command to the application changes the state of the document. The applicant submits that each of claims 17, 18, 41, and 42 is therefore now clearly allowable.

Similarly, neither Kulkarni, Nomura, nor Nakajima teaches, as required by amended claims 9 and 39, “receiving from the user a sequence of commands to change the state of the document; changing the document state in response to each command; [and] adding the changed document state to a state history maintained *by the application* in a computer-readable memory device each time the document state is changed”. Accordingly, each of claims 9 and 39 as amended is allowable. The applicant notes that the amendments to claims 9 and 39 make explicit what was previously implied by the language of their preambles, and therefore do not change the scope of either of claims 9 and 39.

Claims 10-15 depend from claim 9 and are allowable at least for the reasons given for claim 9.

Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are allowable at least for the reasons given for claims 18.

Claims 25 and 27-33 depend from claim 22 and are allowable at least for the reasons given for claim 22.

Claim 43 is allowable for at least the same reasons given for claim 22.

Applicant : Hamburg, et al.
Serial No. : 09/010,801
Filed : January 22, 1998
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-235001 / P212

The Examiner rejected claims 34-36 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nomura, Nakajima, and Kulkarni in view of the article by David Kurlander and Steven Feiner ("Kurlander and Feiner").

Claims 34-36 and 44 depend from claim 22 and are allowable at least for the reasons given for claim 22.

Enclosed is a check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Jan 26, 2004



Tamara Fraizer
Reg. No. 51,699

Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071